UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,525	06/15/2001	Paul Egli	6783P016	9946
	7590 10/07/200 KOLOFF TAYLOR &	EXAMINER		
	AD PARKWAY CA 04085 4040	RAMPURIA, SATISH		
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2191		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/882,525	EGLI, PAUL		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	SATISH S. RAMPURIA	2191	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 19 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	r, or other evidence, www. with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1		THROT KEI ET WAR	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply original than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	"	"I I WI !	5.11
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the company. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS		201 - 61 - 6 - 11	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, k They raise new issues that would require further cor They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowment) 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-45</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>7-40</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Wei Y Zhen/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to applicants argument, that combination of Rollins and Claussen fails to teach the limitations "upon execution of the Web application including an embedded customized command tag in a Web page, invoking the customized command tag for conditionally executing said specified at least one custom action based on run-time conditions of the Web application and run-time values for one or more attributes included in the customized command tag." As indicate in previous action that Both Rollins and Claussen disclose method and system to be used by Web applications and/or develop Web applications. More specifically, Rollins discloses XML (i.e., customized code/tag) application development, which is done on the Web environment and used by the World Wide Web (page 2 [0015-0016]). Claussen discloses processing the custom tag in a document object mode (DOM) representation that is an internal XML document data structure representation and basically a tree of all nodes in an XML file (col. 3, lines 14-52). More particularly, Claussen discloses a document object model (DOM) tree is processed to identify custom tags. Upon encountering a custom tag, an appropriate tag handler (e.g., a Java object, an XSL stylesheet, or the like) is invoked. A tag registration routine is used for recognizing and handling case-insensitive custom tags. As a servlet engine is examining a tag name, if the name does not match one of the registered tags, the routine converts the name to lower or neutral case. If the tag recognition routine recognizes the name as one of the case-insensitive tags, it converts the attributes to the appropriate case, and hands the resulting element off to a correct tag handler for processing (col. 3, lines 30-44; col. 7, lines 5-35). Claussen is clearly indicating that custom tags (I.e., XML) are handled by appropriate tag handler i.e., invoking appropriate tag handler based upon custom tag encountered, e.g., custom tags executed conditionally based upon the condition of XML tag/code. Therefore, the combination of Rollins with Claussen discloses the cited limitations as described above.